

which were in conflict with the Anti-Trust Act, thus bringing the assailed combination under the law of the land and leaving it to be controlled by such law.

It follows from what we have said that the decree below giving effect to the mandate of this court will be modified so as to recognize the right of the Terminal Company as an accessory to its strictly terminal business to carry on transportation as to business exclusively originating on its lines, exclusively moving thereon and exclusively intended for delivery on the same and in other respects the decree will be affirmed.

Modified and affirmed.

MR. JUSTICE HOLMES and MR. JUSTICE McREYNOLDS took no part in the decision of this case.

EVENS AND HOWARD FIRE BRICK COMPANY *v.*
UNITED STATES.

APPEAL FROM THE DISTRICT COURT OF THE UNITED STATES
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF MISSOURI.

No. 567. Argued October 23, 1914.—Decided February 23, 1915.

The court below, in settling the decree on the mandate of this court has no power to allow persons who were not parties to the action to intervene. This court, however, can take action on an original petition for intervention in this court. (See pp. 194, 199, *ante*.)

THE facts are stated in the opinion.

Mr. George M. Block, with whom *Mr. John F. Lee* was on the brief, for appellants.

236 U. S.

Syllabus.

Mr. Edward C. Crow, with whom *The Solicitor General* was on the brief, for the United States.

MR. CHIEF JUSTICE WHITE delivered the opinion of the court.

This appeal was taken from the order of the court refusing to allow an intervention on the ground that there was no jurisdiction to do so because as the result of a previous final decree and an appeal taken therefrom by the United States, the authority of the court over the subject-matter was ended. In effect the relief which was sought to be accomplished by the intervention below has been obtained as the result of an original petition for intervention here and our action this day taken thereon. As those applying to intervene were not parties to the record, we are of opinion that the court below had no power to allow them to intervene under the circumstances which existed and its judgment refusing their application was therefore right and is

Affirmed.

OLYMPIA MINING & MILLING COMPANY, LIMITED, v. KERNS.

ERROR TO THE SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF IDAHO.

No. 495. Motion to dismiss or affirm submitted January 25, 1915.—
Decided February 23, 1915.

This court has no jurisdiction under § 237, Judicial Code, to review the judgment of a state court, sustaining a demurrer to the complaint on the ground of statutory limitations, unless the Federal questions asserted as a basis for such jurisdiction were presented or suggested to the court below. *Appleby v. Buffalo*, 221 U. S. 524.